



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/791,644	03/02/2004	Alan F. Rozich	PMCBIO 3.0-008	3048
530	7590	09/17/2007	EXAMINER	
LERNER, DAVID, LITTEMBERG, KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK 600 SOUTH AVENUE WEST WESTFIELD, NJ 07090			BARRY, CHESTER T	
		ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER
		1724		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		09/17/2007		PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Response to Rule 312 Communication</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/791,644	ROZICH, ALAN F.
	Examiner Chester T. Barry	Art Unit 1724

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

1.  The amendment filed on 24 August 2007 under 37 CFR 1.312 has been considered, and has been:

- a)  entered.
- b)  entered as directed to matters of form not affecting the scope of the invention.
- c)  disapproved because the amendment was filed after the payment of the issue fee.  
Any amendment filed after the date the issue fee is paid must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.313(c)(1) and the required fee to withdraw the application from issue.
- d)  disapproved. See explanation below.
- e)  entered in part. See explanation below.

*The proposed amendment seeks to correct a typographical error in the first paragraph of the specification. MPEP 714.16 states that*

*"Consideration of an amendment under 37 CFR 1.312 cannot be demanded as a matter of right. Prosecution of an application should be conducted before, and thus be complete including editorial revision of the specification and claims at the time of the Notice of Allowance. However, where amendments of the type noted are shown (A) to be needed for proper disclosure or protection of the invention, and (B) to require no substantial amount of additional work on the part of the Office, they may be considered and, if proper, entry may be recommended by the primary examiner."*

*In this case, the correction to the specification is of an editorial nature. Furthermore, even though the change would require no substantial amount of additional work on the part of the Office, the proposed change is not needed for proper disclosure or protection of the invention.*



Chester T. Barry  
571-272-1152 direct  
Art Unit: 1724